



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

thousands a year from their abundant resources. With \$10,000 a year, we would, with God's blessing, soon move the nation, and make the world feel our influence in this blessed cause.

LICENTIOUSNESS OF THE NAVY.

A disclosure of the whole truth on this subject would probably startle the community. They hear the navy eulogized as the nation's glory, while it is in fact a floating Sodom. We shall not now attempt a full exposure of its character in this respect, but will restrict ourselves for the present to a specimen or two.

In one of the documents of the late London Peace Convention on "*the moral and religious statistics of war*," containing the substance of answers given by *naval officers* to a series of questions, we find the following statement: "Another vice which is exhibited in a very revolting form, is *fornication*. At all the seaports, large numbers of prostitutes are found, and these, on a ship coming into port, are frequently *allowed* to come and *live on board*; though there are many officers who insist, that the marriage certificate shall be produced before permission is given for a seaman to have his *wife* on board. In foreign ports, where it is not thought convenient for the men to have permission to go on shore, women are allowed to come off in the evening, and they are sent on shore again in the morning. This is particularly adopted in the ports in India, where great danger would probably accrue to the men from the excesses they would run into on shore; and hence this horrible alternative is resorted to."

The following tale from the N. Y. Courier of last summer, gives us another glimpse at the licentiousness of the navy. "On Thursday night, between ten and eleven o'clock, a shore boat rowed by one man, and containing a young female, came along side the U. S. ship Independence, lying off Ellis' Island, and on being hailed, the female desired to know if midshipman ——— was on board. On being answered in the affirmative, she insisted on seeing him; but the officer of the deck told her that was impossible, as not only the regulations of the ship, but the rules of the service forbade it. She urged, implored and entreated; but the officer, actuated by a stern sense of duty, was still compelled to adhere to his original resolution of refusing her admittance on board. Finding that he was inexorable, the young girl, without a moment's thought, sprang from the boat in which she had been standing, and sunk. A seaman who had been in the fore chains, listening to the girl's conversation, saw her make the spring, and, as she touched the water, he sprang overboard after her, and a few lusty strokes brought him to the spot as she arose. He seized her, and holding her up, the shore boat dropped along side of them, and took in the unfortunate girl and her gallant preserver.

"The officer of the deck had her brought on board, and, surmising that something extraordinary must have occurred to induce the female to attempt suicide, he summoned the first lieutenant. When he reached the deck, he drew from her a history of the causes which brought her out at that hour of the night to such a place; and it was one of love, confidence, ruin, and subsequent desertion. The midshipman who was the cause of the poor girl's troubles, was called on deck, and being confronted with her, was at once recognized. What steps the first lieutenant next took with the recreant officer, we are ignorant of as yet; but the young girl was sent on shore, having first given her address, with the assurance that full and ample justice should be done, as soon as the Commodore arrived."

This assurance, we presume, was the last that the poor dupe and victim heard of redress. Redress! from *gentlemen* (!) of the sword for *such* an outrage! Such deeds of female ruin are generally matters of pride and

boasting with the epauletted libertines that throng every navy in Christendom. The case related above, is only one of a thousand,—probably a pretty fair specimen of the officers, as the preceding one was of common sailors. Nor do we charge all this to any special degree of depravity ; it is the legitimate, common, almost invariable result of the war-system. The *man* is the victim of the *custom*.

WAR CHAPLAINS.

During a debate in Congress last spring, Mr. Pettit, in amendment of a resolve appropriating a salary of \$600 a year to chaplains, moved to dispense with their services, mainly on account of the *incompatibility between the principles of the gospel, and the practices of war* ; a position on which the speaker's views, as reported in the papers, we give with but slight abridgment :

“ Is the institution of the Christian religion such a measure as ought to be of necessity or of propriety introduced, or which ought to be encouraged, in the army or the navy of the United States? What are the fundamental articles of that religion? What ought our navy and our army to do with it? Does it afford encouragement to vigilance and energy in the discharge of the engagements they have undertaken towards the government of the United States? If we were living under the Jewish dispensation, where the law was, ‘an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,’ with some propriety might we employ Jewish priests; ay, if we were followers of the later prophet, that had come with sword in his hand, and enforced his religion by fire and sword, we might with propriety employ chaplains of *that* persuasion. But what does the Christian religion teach? Humble, entire submission to every species of indignity and wrong that may be offered. The doctrine of the resentment of wrongs cannot be found within the teachings of the Saviour of mankind. What did the very Founder, the head and front of that religion? Did he not, clothed indeed with human shape, but possessing omnipotent power and wisdom, suffer indignities, submit to be spit upon, and have a crown of thorns platted and put upon his head? And did he resent it? But who that is a meek follower of him would say that he had not the power to do it?

“ But let us look from his practice to his precept. He said, in olden times it was said, ‘An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say to you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.’ This is the doctrine, in substance, of the Christian religion. It is non-resistance; and to me the employment of chaplains in the army and navy is much more fitting to the time when the thunder of Sinai was obeyed, than under the mild teachings of the babe of Bethlehem. It is incompatible with our institutions, with the religion we profess, and ought not to be encouraged.

“ What is the duty of a chaplain in our army? It is, as a venerable member of this House has said, in reply to this interrogatory, it is to imbue the sailors and soldiers with the spirit of the Christian religion. Now, what would be the consequences of this? Instead of firing them with zeal, with energy, with revenge, so far as the repulsion of injury is concerned, it is to tell them, ‘Humbly submit; receive whatever indignity may be offered, and let it be tripled upon you, and make no resistance whatever.’ It is incompatible with the spirit of our institutions, and with their organization.”

* This article, prepared several months ago, and omitted at the time for want of room, we now insert, to let our readers see how little reason there was for misconceiving the allusions made to this subject by Dr. Channing, in his address at our late anniversary, when he said, in effect, that Mr. Pettit was right in representing war as incompatible with Christianity, and insisting that it is improper to employ the ministers of the latter in abetting or countenancing the deeds of the former.